DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 147 HE 016 221

AUTHOR Pollicita, James R.; Hanna, Donald E.

TITLE Research for Policy: Faculty Perceptions and Policy Modifications to Enhance the Role of Continuing Education.

PUB DATE Apr 83

NOTE 58p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Canada, April 11-15, 1983).

AVAILABLE FROM Office of Continuing Education, University of Illinois, Champaign, IL 61820

PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS *Continuing Education; *Evaluation Criteria; *Faculty Evaluation; Guides; Higher Education; *Outreach Programs; Personnel Policy; Productivity; School Community Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Promotion; *Tenure

ABSTRACT

A project to develop criteria for evaluating the quality of faculty outreach activities in continuing education and public service is described. The project, which was conducted at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, was also designed to achieve the utilization of these criteria by faculty members engaged in outreach and by staff who were involved in promotion and tenure evaluation. The following objectives guided the project: identify influential people or gatekeepers, study the social context in which gatekeeper behavior occurs, utilize problem solving in groups to increase participation, and use experts to feed information to groups. A survey was conducted to determine which criteria were judged important by: faculty who conducted continuing education and public service activities and staff who served on promotion and tenure committees. A rank-order list of 40 criteria statements is presented, along with a sample questionnaire. Data on the comparative importance of the criteria and on the appropriate sources of evaluative information for each criterion were incorporated in a faculty guide relating continuing education/public service to promotion/tenure. A copy of the guide and a bibliography are appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED230147

ABSTRACT

RESEARCH FOR POLICY: FACULTY PERCEPTIONS AND POLICY MODIFICATIONS TO ENHANCE THE ROLE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

James R. Pollicita
University of Notre Dame

Donald E. Hanna
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

This paper describes a project conducted at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign to achieve three interrelated goals: (1) the development of criteria for evaluating the quality of faculty outreach activities in continuing education and public service; (2) the utilization of these criteria by faculty members engaged in outreach activities; and (3) the acceptance of these criteria by faculty members and academic administrators who are involved in the campus's promotion and tenure evaluation process.

An action research model (Lewin, 1946, 1947; Clark, 1976; Price and Pollister, 1980) consisting of a cyclical process of fact-finding, action and evaluation was used to frame the project. The following principles guided the project:

1) Identify influentials or gatekeepers
2) Study the social context in which gatekeeper behavior takes place
3) Utilize problem-solving in groups to increase participation, and
4) Use experts to feed information to groups as required.

HE 016 221

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James R. Pollicita

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Printed in U.S.A.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Project activities were selected to conform with Lindquist (1978) and Votruba's (1981) characteristics of successful planned change efforts. The strategy adopted by the team was based upon organizational change theory as expressed by Havelock (1973), Lindquist (1978), and Votruba (1981). The rationale behind the team's efforts is described more fully in the companion paper prepared by Votruba for this AERA symposium. Overall, the approach parallels Houle's description of one academic vice-president's attempt to win faculty support for an external degree, that is, "...gradualism--the movement of an initially peripheral activity toward the center of the institition" (Houle, 1973:142).

RESEARCH FOR POLICY: FACULTY PERCEPTIONS AND POLICY MODIFICATIONS TO ENHANCE THE ROLE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

James R. Pollicita

University of Notre Dame

Donald E. Hanna

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Since the beginning of the continuing higher education movement, the attraction and retention of able faculty have been major problems (Grattan, 1955; Knowles, 1969). At the turn of the century, Herbert Baxter Adams cited the following among the adverse influences against what was then the new enterprise of university extension:

> "...the limited number of lecturers able to deal successfully with adults, lack of money; lack of time and energy on the part of university people who had to put campus duties first; and administrative subordination of extension to campus activities." (Grattan, 1955:191)

Today, incentives and rewards for faculty members who participate in continuing education activities remain critical to the success of any

Printed in U.S.A.

university outreach mission. Yet, as in Adams's day, a faculty member's involvement in these activities is scarcely considered when decisions are made regarding promotion, tenure, or salary status (Centra, 1977; Hohenstein, 1980; Seldin, 1975). Recognizing this, many faculty members understandably hesitate to participate in continuing education and concentrate instead on activities that "count" and are more consistent with discipline-related values (McCarthy, 1980).

Faced with a faculty reluctant to participate in continuing education as a regular assignment, many universities have either developed alternative incentives and rewards (including separate, but less powerful, extrinsic rewards such as overload pay) or separate faculties who devote all of their time to outreach activities and who are rewarded independently of the traditional faculty. However, these methods are generally recognized as subordinate to the institution's primary reward system and do little to change faculty perceptions of the value of continuing education. They may in fact reinforce the marginality of such efforts by providing an alternative means of reward.

Additional limitations of separate reward mechanisms are noted by Knox (1975), Patton (1975), Hanna (1978), and Votruba (1978). At best, they can be described as necessary but not sufficient in attracting and applying maximum resources to educational needs of individuals and communities. Indeed, Votruba (1978) states that unless outreach activities are more fully integrated into the primary faculty reward system and accepted as criteria for salary, promotion, and tenure decisions, continuing education and public service stand little chance of achieving more than peripheral status in the

iversity.

Knox (1975) supports this view, arguing that in order to attract the most able faculty members to continuing education and public service, adequate institutional rewards are important. The most powerful extrinsic rewards for university faculty members are those mediated through the promotion and tenure system (McKeachie, 1979; Tuckman, 1979; Votruba, 1978). Competition for promotions and tenure is increasing. Continuing education administrators have "...an unprecedented stake in the attention to continuing education and public service activities in the institutional reward system" (Knox, 1975:7).

Despite the apparent importance of institutional rewards such as promotion, tenure, and salary, continuing education is not part of the formal evaluation system in many institutions. In a survey of continuing education administrators, McCarthy (1978, 1980) found that almost half of her sample indicated that continuing education and public service were not part of faculty evaluation criteria at their institutions. University of Illinois faculty members with experience on promotion and tenure committees support this finding, indicating that evaluation of the quality of outreach activities in promotion and tenure papers is sketchy, if present at all. As a result, quality outreach activities rarely contribute to a positive promotion and tenure decision.

Faculty members who participate in continuing education and public service do so for many reasons, most of which are intrinsic to the tasks involved (Hanna, 1978; Patton, 1975). Also, they tend to be those whose tenure battles are behind them (Hanna, 1978). To attract other faculty to

outreach activities, continuing educators must maximize extrinsic rewards such as promotion, tenure, and salary.

This paper describes a project conducted at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign to achieve three interrelated goals: (1) the development of criteria for evaluating the quality of faculty outreach activities in continuing education and public service; (2) the utilization of these criteria by faculty members engaged in outreach activities; and (3) the acceptance of these criteria by faculty members and academic administrators who are involved in the campus's promotion and tenure evaluation process.

An action research model (Lewin, 1946 and 1947; Clark, 1976; and Price and Pollister, 1980) consisting of a cyclical process of fact-finding, action and evaluation was used to frame the project.

The following principles guided the project:

1) Identify influentials or gatekeepers
2) Study the social context in which gatekeeper behavior takes place
3) Utilize problem-solving in groups to increase participation, and
4) Use experts to feed information to groups as required.

Project activities were selected to conform with Lindquist (1978) and Votruba's (1981) characteristics of successful planned change efforts. The strategy adopted by the team was based upon organizational change theory as expressed by Havelock (1973), Lindquist (1978), and Votruba (1981). The rationale behind the team's efforts is described more fully in the

companion paper prepared by Votruba for this AERA symposium. Overall, the approach parallels Houle's description of one academic vice-president's attempt to win faculty support for an external degree, that is, "...gradualism--the movement of an initially peripheral activity toward the center of the institition" (Houle, 1973:142).

The Environmental Setting

The Urbana-Champaign campus of the University of Illinois (UIUC) is a research-oriented institution and the land-grant university of the state of Illinois. The Office of Continuing Education and Public Service (OCEPS) works with campus faculty members to offer a great variety of courses and programs. Conferences and Institutes, Guided Individual Study, Extramural Courses, and Program Development are the major operating units of OCEPS, which both initiates programs and responds to the initiatives of campus academic units by assisting in program development, administration, and evaluation.

Programs offered through OCEPS constitute a sizeable portion of the outreach activity of the campus, although the Cooperative Extension Service and various institutes and departmental units also offer many continuing education and public service programs. In this sense, administration of continuing education and public service on the campus is decentralized. One characteristic of administrative decentralization of university outreach activities is an essential dependence of the central continuing education office upon other academic units for the employment and maintenance of human

resources (Crispin, 1979).

In the 1970s the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign began to devote increasing attention to faculty participation in continuing education and public service. Several factors contributed to this increased attention, including changing population demographics, the need to more visibly demonstrate public service to the citizens of Illinois, an increase in the number of academic departments involved in continuing education and increased support from campus administrators. These factors combined to strengthen institutional rhetoric and to give greater support and legitimacy to faculty outreach activities. For example, in 1973, the campus senate endorsed the following resolution.

> Campus and college-level procedures should be modified so that there are greater incentives and rewards for high quality faculty participation as resource persons in university-sponsored continuing education and public service activities.

Concern about ambiguity of existing criteria for evaluating the quality of faculty outreach activities prompted the vice-chancellor for academic affairs to commission an Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching and Service in 1975. His charge to the committee made clear that high quality continuing education activities alone could never ensure a successful promotion or tenure decision.

> I am not asking the committee to develop procedures or a rationale for a multi-track system in which one might be promoted on the basis of teaching or research or service. In my view (and the Campus Committee on Promotion and Tenure appears to agree),

research, scholarship, and creative artistry of high quality must be demonstrated if one is to successfully be recommended for promotion and indefinite tenure. However, in many instances outstanding performance in teaching and/or service, if the case is well documented, can result in a favorable outcome when the record of scholarship is not quite sufficient.

The final report of the Committee on Teaching and Service demonstrated this concern for documentation by providing a framework for identifying criteria and sources of evidence to use in evaluation of outreach activities. The framework was presented in the form of a grid composed of twenty-nine "Characteristics of Faculty Performance in Outreach" (Appendix 1). The grid was included in the report to guide faculty members in the evaluation of outreach activities for purposes of consideration in promotion and tenure decisions.

In the fall of 1978, the vice-chancellor for academic affairs again addressed the issue of evaluation of faculty outreach efforts.

> The reward system for continuing education and public service is important, and we do have in the process at Urbana-Champaign a section in the promotion and tenure process dealing with that area. As I read those sections each year, I have the feeling that many people seem to be engaged in such activity but that none of it is evaluated. The activity of the Urbana-Champaign faculty, by and large, is not rewarded in this area because nobody bothers to tell the administration or to find out whether they do a good job or not; this is a serious problem. We must, if this is to be a

part of the promotion and tenure process, find a way of assessing the quality of that work just as we do for on-campus instruction, scholarly work, creative artistry, and the rest of what goes into promotion and tenure.

Clearly, the vice-chancellor's remarks indicated that more systematic evaluation of faculty outreach activities would be required to significantly contribute to a successful promotion and tenure decision.

The Project

In the fall of 1978, a four-person project team composed of administrators and instructors was formed within the Office of Continuing Education and Public Service to strengthen the relationship between faculty outreach activities and the campus promotion and tenure system. Aware of past activities initiated by the vice-chancellor for academic affairs, the team members notified the vice-chancellor of their interest in criteria development. Members of the Campus Council on Continuing Education and Public Service (some of whom had served on the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching and Service--authors of the 1975 report) and members of campus, college, and departmental promotion and tenure committees were also informed of the project team's interest, and simultaneously were consulted on directions the team might take.

To inform themselves on the background of the problem, team members solicited and received permission from the vice-chancellor for academic affairs to review previously submitted promotion and tenure dossiers. Their review of over three hundred files provided evidence that very few

continuing education and public service activities had been described and even fewer had been evaluated in any systematic manner. When mentioned in promotion and tenure papers, outreach activities were simply listed with little or no additional information.

Next, additional discussions with campus, college, and departmental promotion and tenure committee members--those who mediate the primary rewards for faculty members--helped to further define the problem by focusing on the types of outreach activities these decision makers deemed worthy of consideration. To provide a formal means of continued input to the project and to add credibility to the project, an advisory committee was formed from key faculty members and academic college administrators serving on the Campus Council on Continuing Education and Public Service. For the team, general impressions were forming regarding the current state of evaluation of outreach activities and the expectation of faculty members responsible for deciding which activities to reward.

To assist in further determining the project team's direction, discussions were arranged with continuing education administrators from other universities. The team found that their concern was common, and that few others had made a systematic attempt to collaborate on their campus to develop criteria for relating outreach activities to promotion and tenure decisions. Other continuing education administrators were very interested in the potential outcome of the team's efforts despite their somewhat skeptical prognoses about the ultimate impact of the project.

Following nearly a year of document reviews and discussions with others both on the UIUC campus and from other institutions, the team began a

systematic clarification of criteria and the development of guidelines to be shared with campus faculty members interested in selecting, developing, evaluating, and reporting their outreach activities in ways that would relate more positively to the campus promotion and tenure review process.

Desirable project outcomes, from the team's perspective, would ultimately result in increased faculty awareness of the importance of continuing education and public service as an institutional mission and increased rewards for outstanding faculty performance in these activities. Increased rewards would be based upon greater integration of continuing education and public service into the central mission of the campus: instruction and scholarship. The goal of the project was not to reorient the promotion and tenure criteria of the campus to any great degree, but to discover ways in which criteria related to instruction and scholarship might be used to evaluate faculty outreach activities. The tasks before the team were to translate tacit values into explicit criteria, publicize the criteria among the faculty, and support their utilization and acceptance.

While official statements by the vice-chancellor for academic affairs and others supported the outreach mission of the institution, administrative statements do not guarantee faculty involvement in outreach activities (Patton, 1975). At UIUC, as at most universities, distribution of the primary rewards of promotion and tenure is conducted by the faculty who are members of promotion and tenure review committees at the departmental, college, and campus levels of organization. Their criteria must be satisfied in order to receive promotion or tenure. It is imperative, therefore, that continuing education administrators and faculty members who

are active in continuing education and public service clearly understand the criteria by which their outreach activities will be evaluated. It is equally important for promotion and tenure committee members to realize the types of criteria most specific to the assessment of quality in continuing education and public service.

The Faculty Survey

A survey research study was conducted in an effort to determine which criteria were held to be most important to two subgroups of faculty; those who conduct continuing education and public service activities and those who serve on departmental, college, and campus promotion and tenure committees.

The general recommendations in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching and Service were used as the point of departure in the development of criteria statements to be rated by survey respondents. Each of the characteristics identified in the report's grid was written in the form of an affirmative criteria statement. Additional potential criteria statements were written based upon the interviews initially conducted with promotion and tenure committee members and academic department heads. Other statements were developed by synthesizing major propositions from selected literature on the evaluation of continuing education and on the evaluation of faculty performance in colleges and universities. One hundred thirty statements were developed; forty were ultimately included in the survey questionnaire. The statements were limited through extended discussions

with education faculty members experienced in faculty evaluation and continuing education and project team members who had conducted the interviews with committee members and department heads, and through the identification and elimination of statements with duplicate meanings. Each statement was then paired with a seven-point Likert-type scale of importance ranging from "low" (1) to "high" (7).

Each of the forty criteria statements was also paired with a column in which respondents were asked to indicate the most appropriate single source of evaluative information for each type of evidence. Additional items were directed primarily at determining the extent of each subject's familiarity with continuing education and public service activities and the promotion and tenure review process through personal involvement during the prior three academic years.

A sample of UIUC departments was selected based upon their levels of past participation in outreach activities. From the eleven departments in the sample, all members of the departmental promotion and tenure review committee were surveyed. Other faculty members within each department were randomly selected to receive the questionnaire. In addition, each member of the parent college promotion and tenure review committee, and all current members of the campus promotion and tenure review committee were included in the sample.

The two hundred fifty-five faculty members included in the sample were sent the seven-page, forty-five item questionnaire (Appendix 2) through campus mail in May, 1980. They were asked to return it through campus mail (in an enclosed addressed envelope) by June 6, 1980. A follow-up postcard

was sent to those who did not return completed questionnaires within two weeks of the original mailing. The vice-chancellor for academic affairs supported the survey by signing a cover letter which asked that faculty members cooperate by completing and returning it. Subjects were tracked through the use of a six-digit confidential identification number. Actual identities of the subjects were known only to the graduate assistant conducting the survey, and all responses were kept anonymous. The questionnaire and procedures were approved by the UIUC Institutional Review Board concerned with the use of human subjects in research.

Those responding to the questionnaire, 56% of the total sample, represented considerable experience on promotion and tenure committees. Seventy-nine percent (79%) served at least three years on promotion and tenure committees at either the department, college, or campus level. Thirty-eight percent (38%) were currently serving on such a committee at the time of the survey, and sixty-two percent (62%) were not. The return rates were essentially the same for faculty members who were then serving on promotion and tenure committees (53% rate of return) and those who were not (54%). As a result, the data-producing group shows about the same proportion of current committee members to non-committee members as the original sample.

The mean percentage of self-reported professional participation in continuing education and public service activities for the total group of respondents was about twenty-two percent (22%). Over the three-year period covered by the questionnaire, the group's involvement in continuing education and public service remained constant. Seventy-one percent (71%)

of the respondents held tenure, and twenty-eight percent (28%) were untenured.

The questionnaire returns were analyzed by: 1) ordinal ranking of the criteria statements according to the mean importance score for each item based upon the total sample responses; 2) conceptual categorization of the items and comparison of the rankings obtained by the statements in each category, and; 3) two-way analysis of variance to assess the effects of continuing education and public service activity and promotion and tenure committee service on "importance ratings" given each criteria statement.

A conceptual categorization of the forty items into five groups provided some additional insight. The five categories constructed were Research, Policy, Research/Practice, Practice, and Other. Assignment of criteria statements to each of the categories was done by the investigator using the following conceptual guidelines:

RESEARCH items are statements concerned specifically with the activities or products usually associated with on-campus discipline-oriented research.

POLICY includes items which refer specifically to public policy and the policy-making process.

RESEARCH/PRACTICE includes items that mention both research and practice.

PRACTICE includes items that refer directly to practice or practitioners and not included in the RESEARCH/PRACTICE category.

OTHER includes items not covered by the categories listed above. These items tend to be concerned with on-campus instruction,

materials developed for the outreach activity, and actual attributes of instructional method or technique employed by a faculty member during an outreach activity.

The total group of faculty sampled rated the forty statements as indicated in the accompanying table. The item averages fell between 3.03 and 6.32 on the seven-point scale from (1) low importance to (7) high importance, as shown in the accompanying table. The highest mean rating was received by item which stated: "The activity led to the generation of new theory in the faculty member's field." The lowest mean rating was received by the item which stated: "Results of the activity were reported at a local meeting of practitioners."

The ratings are not very surprising to those familiar with the ethos of major research universities--"publish or perish." To the extent that these ratings reflect the aggregate opinion of committee members and some faculty members involved in outreach activities, the extreme ends of the rank-ordering are particularly informative. They clearly reflect the central criteria for promotion and tenure issued by the vice-chancellor for academic affairs; that is, promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor requires solid promise of national stature in one's field, and promotion from Associate to Full Professor requires fulfillment of that promise. Recognition resulting from generation of new theory in a field-- or identification as one who is at the "leading edge" of a field is rated most

TABLE 1

RANK-ORDER LIST OF FORTY CRITERIA STATEMENTS
BY TOTAL GROUP MEAN RATING

Category	Focus of Statement	Rank	Mean Rating
Research	Generation of new theory in field	1	6.32
Research	Demonstration that faculty member at leading edge	2	6.14
Policy	Special recognition from national assoc. of scholars	3	6.03
Research	Activity had direct public policy impact	4	5.93
Policy	Results published in noted research journal	5	5.85
Research/ Practice	As a result of activity, policymakers request help	6	5.83
Research	Activity involved creative application of research to practice	7	5.63
Practice	Work on activity cited in scholarly journals	8	5.61
Research	Special recognition from nat'l practitioner assoc.	9	5.45
Practice	Direct connection to research in faculty field	10	5.37
Research/ Practice	Results published in noted practitioner journal	11	5.33
Research/ Practice	Practitioners more aware of theory in practice	12	5.31
Practice	Closer relationships between practitioners & scholars	13	5.27
Research	Participant practice improved	14	5.21
Other	Results reported at national scholars meeting	15	5.17
Other	Standardized evaluation of faculty member high	16	5.04
Practice	The activity met a clear educational need	17	5.00
Other	Activity cited in practitioner journals	18	4.99
Other	Materials requested by other college faculty	19	4.98
Other	Materials reflect recent research in field	20	4.97
Other	New educational need identified	21	4.96
Other	Activity materials were subsequently published	22	4.89
Other	Sponsors plan similar activities	23	4.83
Practice	Activity benefited own on-campus instruction	24	4.75
Other	Report at national meeting of practitioners	25	4.75
Research	Materials adopted on-campus by other faculty	26	4.71
Other	Recognition received from regional assoc. of scholars	27	4.65
Other	Content and participant concerns balanced	28	4.64
Research	Practice opportunities were provided	29	4.50
Other	Recognition received from state assoc. of scholars	30	4.50
Practice	New groups of adults were served	31	4.37
Practice	Recognition received from regional practitioners	32	4.33
Other	Recognition received from state practitioners	33	4.26
Research	Independent inquiry encouraged during activity	34	4.22
Research	Results reported to state meeting of scholars	35	4.19
Practice	Report to regional meeting of scholars	36	4.10
Practice	Recognition received from local practitioners	37	3.95
Practice	Results reported to regional practitioners	38	3.93
Practice	Results reported to state practitioners	39	3.79
Practice	Results reported to local practitioners	40	3.03

highly. More limited exposure to local, state, or regional groups--be they scholars or practitioners--seems to do comparatively little to enhance one's prospects for promotion.

Criteria statements related to research are clearly of highest importance to respondents. Indeed, if the items related to regional and state associations of scholars (both of which are fairly rare organizational arrangements in many fields) were excluded, no research-related item would have received less than a mean rating of five on the seven-point scale. Within the research category, items descended in importance as they moved from acclaim (recognition of leadership), to publication, to reporting results of one's activities.

Analysis of variance showed no significant effects of either Continuing Education and Public Service or committee experience upon importance ratings at $p<.05$ with the following exception. Promotion and tenure committee members tended to value criteria related to the adoption of off-campus materials to on-campus instruction more highly than did non-committee members. The two criteria on which continuing education and public service activity showed the strongest relationship to importance ratings both relate to aspects of instructional method. Faculty members who were more active in outreach activities valued both criteria more highly than did those who were not.

Statements of policy notwithstanding, the findings of this study suggest that at UIUC, as at most research-oriented universities, quality of teaching is a distant second to research productivity as a consideration in the distribution of rewards (Centra, 1977; Tuckman, 1976, 1979). This has

major implications for faculty members as they identify outreach activities in which they wish to become involved in and begin to plan for evaluation of this involvement. While those who are most active in continuing education and public service indicated that some aspects of instructional method should be considered important when evaluating faculty outreach activities, our data show that a close relationship of the outreach activity to research will be more effective in presenting a strong case for promotion and tenure.

The Faculty Guide

Data on the comparative importance of the various criteria and on the appropriate sources of evaluative information for each criterion, and descriptive information gathered previously through the document review and interviews, were incorporated into an initial draft of "A Faculty Guide for Relating Continuing Education and Public Service to the Promotion and Tenure Review Process." The first product was a sixty-five page document--clearly a first draft.

This first draft was circulated to members of the Campus Council on Continuing Education and Public Service, selected current and former members of promotion and tenure review committees, a few other faculty members, and the vice-chancellor for academic affairs, along with specific questions to consider as they reviewed the copy. In a sense, an ad hoc editorial review committee, similar to many professional journal article review committees, was formed. Reviewers were asked to comment on content, form, specific passages, and typography. Suggestions were also solicited regarding the final format and means of distribution for the guide.

As a result of this initial review, the draft was reduced to thirty-five pages. It was strongly suggested that the guide be distributed in the early fall semester, along with other promotion and tenure information, and that it be distributed by the vice-chancellor for academic affairs. However, the vice-chancellor was not receptive to distributing a document of this length to all faculty and suggested that the guide be shortened. During the next few weeks, the guide was shortened to fifteen pages plus a two-page abstract. Still hesitant to include the entire guide with the fall semester promotion and tenure mailing, the vice-chancellor agreed to mention the guide's availability in this material. In addition, he signed a letter which accompanied the abstract in a mailing to deans and department heads. In both of these documents, he indicated that the guide was available from the Office of Continuing Education and Public Service and that copies would be sent upon request. In addition, an announcement of the guide's availability was printed in the weekly staff newspaper.

The faculty guide (Appendix 3) represents a summary of all findings of the project team, presented in the form of recommendations to faculty members who are or might become involved in outreach activities and who wish to include these activities in their case for promotion and/or tenure. The guide suggests a process for planning and evaluating continuing education and public service activities so that they will contribute to a positive decision. Four major points are emphasized in the guide:

1) Faculty outreach efforts are most highly valued when they help demonstrate that the faculty member is at the "leading edge" and making significant contributions to new knowledge in his or her

discipline or profession. Promotion and tenure committee members suggest that continuing education and public service efforts contribute most to scholarly stature when they: are reported or cited in scholarly publications, are shown to have impact upon public policy, or demonstrate innovative breakthroughs in linking theory with practice.

2) Senior faculty members from other comparable institutions represent a valuable source of evidence regarding the quality of a faculty member's continuing education and public service activities. In particular, they can comment on the extent to which these activities have made a substantial contribution to the discipline or profession and the extent to which they have been recognized by other scholars, public policy makers, or practitioners.

3) When continuing education and public service activities are to be presented in promotion and tenure papers, they should be planned with that use in mind. Faculty members should plan their activities far in advance and design them for qualitative evaluation by promotion and tenure committees. Department chairs or heads should be involved in the planning process in order to ensure that the proposed activities are consistent with departmental expectations. Departmental executive committee members, senior faculty members, and promotion and tenure committee members should also be asked to share their insights regarding the campus promotion and tenure process.

4) When preparing promotion and tenure papers, those continuing education and public service activities which are supportive of the faculty member's scholarly stature must be emphasized. These activities should be carefully and completely described, with particular attention to the evaluation criteria and results. When the normal criteria for judging scholarly excellence are not appropriate for judging a particular outreach activity, alternative criteria should be clearly described and justified.

It is too early to establish the impact of the faculty guide in assisting faculty members who include outreach activities in their cases for promotion and tenure. Certainly, awareness of the importance of outreach activities has been heightened for both promotion and tenure committee members and faculty members in general. The guide has stimulated additional discussion. More than 250 faculty members have requested copies of the guide, and some have consulted with OCEPS staff in the planning, evaluation, and reporting of their continuing education and public service activities. In addition, the guide has been requested by more than 200 individuals representing colleges and universities nationwide who became aware of it through the November 17, 1982, issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education.

Conclusion

The project described in this paper is categorized as "action" research, the principles of which are described by Price and Polister (1980), and include:

a) The identification of a problem or issue that serves as the focus for continuing research, action and evaluation activities;

b) Extensive collaboration with practitioners who face the problem or issue squarely; in this case, faculty members, promotion and tenure committee members,, and others involved in the promotion and tenure process; and

c) An attempt to achieve the dual goals of developing new knowledge and solving practical problems.

The framework for the project utilized a model for change proposed by Havelock and modified by Lindquist, Votruba, and others. The process established: 1) an open environment for inquiry; 2) support, involvement, and ownership from key participants and campus leaders; 3) a close relationship with existing values and practice; and 4) important benefits for those involved in the project.

All of these elements contributed to acceptance of and support for the final product, the faculty guide. The project's degree of success in raising awareness of the need to recognize high quality outreach activities through the promotion and tenure process is due largely to the effectiveness of this approach. The approach enables positive modification of academic values and practice to occur while minimizing resistance to change. As such, the approach may be useful to others who are concerned with the problem of recognizing faculty members who participate in outreach activities in university settings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Becker, W. E., Jr., and Lewis, D. R. "Adaptability to Change and Academic Productivity." In D. R. Lewis and W. E. Becker, Jr. (Eds.), Academic Rewards in Higher Education. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1979.

Campbell, D. T. and Stanley, J. C. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Centra, J. A. How Universities Evaluate Faculty Performance: A Survey of Department Heads. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1977.

Clark, A. W. (Ed.). Experimenting with Organizational Life; The Action Research Approach. New York: Plenum, 1976.

Cohen, M. D., and March, J. G. Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Corson, J. J. "Perspectives on the University Compared with Other Institutions." In J. A. Perkins (Ed.), The University as an Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Crispin, E. A. "A Descriptive Study of the Centralization Structural Dimension of University Extension Units." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1979.

Dornbush, S. M., and Scott, W. R. Evaluation and the Exercise of Authority. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Gratton, C. H. In Quest of Knowledge. New York: Association Press, 1955.

Grotelueschen, A. D., et. al. an Evaluation Planner. Urbana, IL: Office for the Study of Continuing Professional Education, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1974.

Hanna, D. E. "Faculty Participation in Continuing Education: A Case Study." unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1978.

Hanna, D. E. "Securing Faculty Involvement in Continuing Education." NUCEA Continuum, Vol. XLV, No. 4, July, 1981.

Hanna, D. E. "Strengthening Collegiate Faculty Rewards for Continuing Education." In J. C. Votruba (Ed.), New Directions for Continuing Education: Strengthening Organizational Support. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass,, forthcoming.

Havelock, R. G. Planning for Innovation through Dissemination and Utilization of Knowledge Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1971.

Houle, C. O. The External Degree. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Knox, A. B. "Social System Analysis of the Adult Education Agency," New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1967.

Knox, A. B. (Ed.) Enhancing Proficiencies of Continuing Educators. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Knox, A. B. "New Realities: The Administration of Continuing Higher Education," NUEA Spectator, 1976, 39 (22), 6-9.

Knowles, M. S. Higher Adult Education in the United States: The Current Picture, Trends, and Issues. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

Lakner, E. "Faculty Attitudes Toward Continuing Education and Public Service," Urbana IL: Survey Research Laboratory, University of Illinois, 1980.

Lewin, K. "Action research and minority probems." Journal of Social Issues, 1946, 2(4), 34-36.

Lewin, K. "Frontiers in group dynamics: Pat II, Social Planning and Action Research." Human Relations, 1947, 1, 143-155.

Lewis, D. R., and Kellogg, T. E. "Planning and Evaluation Criteria for Allocating Departmental and Collegiate Resources in a University Setting." In D. R. Lewis and W. E. Becker, Jr. (Eds.), Academic Rewards in Higher Education. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1979.

Lindquist, J. Strategies for Change. Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges (CASC), 1978.

McCarthy, Marianne B. "Continuing Education Service as a Component of Faculty Evaluation." paper presented at the Adult Education Research Conference, San Antonio, TX: 1978.

McCarthy, Marianne B. "Continuing Education Service as a Component of Faculty Evaluation." Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years, 1980, 3 (9), 8-11.

McKeachie, W. J. "Perspectives from Psychology: Financial Incentives are Ineffective for Faculty." In D. R. Lewis and W. E. Becker, Jr. (Eds.),

Academic Rewards in Higher Education. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1979.

Patton, C. V. "Extended Education in an Elite Institution: Are There Sufficient Incentives to Encourage Faculty Participation?" Journal of Higher Education, 1975, 46 (4), 427-443.

Price, Richard H. and Politser, Peter E. (Eds.). Evaluation and Action in the Social Environment. New York: Academic Press, Inc. 1980.

Selltiz, C., et. al. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1959.

Simon, J. L. Basic Research Methods in Social Science: The Art of Empirical Investigation. 2nd Edition. New York: Random House, 1978.

Thompson, J. D. Organizations in Action. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Tuckman, B. W. and Oliver, W. F. "Effectiveness of Feedback to Teachers as a Function of Source." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1968, (59), 297-301.

Tuckman, H. P. Publication, Teaching, and the Academic Reward Structure. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath & Co., 1976.

Tuckman, H. P. "The Academic Reward Structure in American Higher Education." In D. R. Lewis and W. E. Backer, Jr. (Eds.), Academic Rewards in Higher Education. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1979.

Votruba, J. C. "Faculty Rewards for University Outreach: An Integrative Approach." Journal of Higher Education. 1978, (49), 639-648.

Votruba, J. C. "Developing a Comprehensive Reward System." in M. A. Brown and H. G. Copeland (Eds.), Attracting Able Instructors of Adults. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Votruba, J. C. "Strategies for Organizational Change." In J. C. Votruba (Ed.), Strengthening Organizational Support. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Votruba, J. C. (Ed.). Strengthening Internal Support for Continuing Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

APPENDIX 1

CHARACTERISTICS OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE IN OUTREACH	SOURCE OF EVIDENCE: 1. Faculty Member	2. Planners	3. Client(s)	4. Consumers	5. Peers	6. Documents
I. Competence						
A. Continuing Education						
1. Content mastery (relate state of art to activity)	X				X	
2. Production of effective materials					X	X
3. Process mastery (instructional methods, settings)		X	X		X	
4. Perspective on issues	X	X			X	
B. Public Service						
1. Specialized expertise at leading edge	X	X			X	
2. Research ability (relevance, procedures, timing, application)	X				X	
II. Responsiveness, Needs						
A. Continuing Education						
1. Match University resources to client needs	X	X				
2. Planning procedures		X				X
3. Adjustments during activity	X	X	X		X	
4. Progress by clients (facilitate their assessment)				X		
B. Public Service						
1. Prepare effective proposal	X	X	X	X	X	X
2. Constructive working relationships	X	X	X			
III. Anticipation, Needs						
A. Continuing Education						
1. Perspective on emerging trends	X	X			X	
2. Helps clients clarify own problems		X	X		X	
3. Demonstrate importance of issues	X	X			X	
4. Move on to new issues		X			X	
B. Public Service						
1. Sound and useful clarification of issues		X	X		X	
2. Identify emerging issues	X		X		X	
IV. Benefits						
A. Continuing Education						
1. Increased client understanding, problem-solving	X		X	X		
2. Application of knowledge (project, legislation)				X		X
3. Positive client attitude toward outreach		X	X			
4. Faculty visibility and expanded impact	X	X			X	
5. Suggest research directions	X				X	
6. Enrich resident instruction	X				X	
7. Professional association or national recognition	X				X	
B. Public Service						
1. Publish evaluation of innovative outreach approach	X		X		X	X
2. Application of findings or recommendations		X	X		X	
3. Assist community group to progress		X				
4. Suggest research directions	X				X	

APPENDIX 2

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

OFFICE OF THE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS · 107 COBLE HALL · CHAMPAIGN, ILLINOIS 61820

May 9, 1980

Dear Colleague:

The following survey is being conducted with two primary objectives in mind. First, we are interested in which criteria should be used to evaluate continuing education and public service activities within the promotion and tenure process at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Second, we hope to identify the most appropriate source of evidence for each criterion.

The results of this survey will provide information of use to faculty members interested in the quality of outreach activity. Among those who might use the results are:

- faculty members in academic departments who spend part or all of their time in continuing education or public service activities;
- department, college, and campus administrators and committees who review faculty promotion materials.

Your responses will remain strictly confidential. When you have completed the survey questionnaire, please place it in the enclosed envelope and return it through campus mail. If you have any questions, or if you would like to discuss the survey, please contact James Pollicita, Office of Continuing Education and Public Service, 103 Illini Hall, 725 S. Wright Street, Champaign; telephone 333-1444.

Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Edwin L. Goldwasser

Edwin L. Goldwasser

ELG:dar

Enclosures

Many members of the UIUC faculty are involved in continuing education and public service as a major part of their professional activity. This survey is intended to collect faculty opinions regarding a.) the extent to which various kinds of evidence of quality should be used in evaluating such activities, and b.) the most appropriate source of evaluation for each kind of evidence submitted. The survey is not concerned with activities for which the faculty member might receive payment from outside the university.

For the purposes of this survey, "activity" is used generically to mean any continuing education or public service activity. "Continuing education" refers to teaching individuals who attend credit and non-credit courses, workshops, or seminars, generally on a part-time or short-term basis. "Public Service" includes decision-oriented applied research and consultation efforts conducted either full-time or as a part of university responsibility.

The terms "scholar" and "practitioner" are used in several items in this questionnaire. "Scholar" is intended to denote those individuals whose professional focus is upon extending, testing, and transmitting knowledge in their field while "practitioner" denotes those whose primary professional focus is upon direct application of such knowledge to the provision of service and the resolution of problems. The distinction may be clearest in applied fields such as agriculture, business, education, law, etc.

The survey should take 15 - 20 minutes to complete. When you have finished, please place the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope and return it through campus mail to:

James R. Pollicita
114 Illini Hall
725 S. Wright Street
Champaign

PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE BY MAY 16, 1980.

As you respond to each item, please react as if you were reviewing the work of a UIUC faculty member who contributes a 20% commitment of time to continuing education and public service activities. Continuing education and public service include a broad range of activities. In the questions below, consider a typical activity from that range.

Please indicate two responses for each of the items listed below. When you have completed the questionniare, please use the enclosed envelope to return it through CAMPUS MAIL.

TYPE OF EVIDENCE PROVIDED	How important do you think each of the following items should be in influencing a decision to award promotions and tenure on the UIUC campus? (Circle one answer code for each item.) Importance Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 High	Which one of the following groups do you feel should be used as the most appropriate single source of evaluation for each type of evidence? (Circle one answer code for each item.) Peers at UIUC	Peers at comparable universities	Participants in the activities	Other (Specify)
1. Results of the activity were reported at a national meeting of practitioners.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
2. As a result of this activity, the faculty member received special recognition from a local association of practitioners.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
3. This activity led to the generation of new theory in the faculty member's field.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
4. The activity was for types of adults previously unserved by the University.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
5. The activity had a direct impact upon public policy.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
6. Results of the activity were reported at a regional meeting of practitioners.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____

How important do you think each of the following items should be in influencing a decision to award promotions and tenure on the UIUC campus? (Circle one answer code for each item.)	Importance Low High	Which one of the following groups do you feel should be used as the most appropriate single source of evaluation for each type of evidence? (Circle one answer code for each item.)			
		Peers at UIUC	Peers at comparable universities	Participants in the activities	Other (Specify)
7. The activity helped identify a previously unrecognized educational need.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
8. Public policy makers have requested the faculty member's assistance as a result of their positive impressions of the activity.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
9. Results of the activity were reported at a state meeting of scholars.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
10. The results of the activity were published in a noted research journal.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
11. There is a direct connection between the activity and the current direction of research in the faculty member's field. . . .	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
12. Results of the activity were reported at a local meeting of practitioners.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
13. Written works (for example, study guides), produced for use in the activity were subsequently published.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
14. Standardized evaluative data are provided regarding the high quality of faculty member's performance in the activity.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____

How important do you think each of the following items should be in influencing a decision to award promotions and tenure on the UIUC campus? (Circle one answer code for each item.)	Importance Low High	Which one of the following groups do you feel should be used as the most appropriate single source of evaluation for each type of evidence? (Circle one answer code for each item.)			
		Peers at UIUC	Peers at comparable universities	Participants in the activities	Other (Specify)
15. As a result of this activity, the faculty member received special recognition from a regional association of scholars.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
16. As a result of this activity, practitioners became aware of the practical implications of theory. .	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
17. As a result of the activity, closer and more constructive working relationships were established between scholars and practitioners. .	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
18. Results of the activity were reported at a state meeting of practitioners.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
19. The activity involved creative application of research to practical problems.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
20. The faculty member's work on this activity was cited in practitioner journals.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
21. The activity demonstrated that the faculty member is at the leading edge of his/her field. . . .	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
22. As a result of this activity the faculty member received special recognition from a national association of scholars.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____

How important do you think each of the following items should be in influencing a decision to award promotions and tenure on the UIUC campus? (Circle one answer code for each item.)	Importance Low High	Which one of the following groups do you feel should be used as the most appropriate single source of evaluation for each type of evidence? (Circle one answer code for each item.)			
		Peers at UIUC	Peers at comparable universities	Participants in the activities	Other (Specify)
23. The activity benefited the faculty member's teaching in the instruction program on campus.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
24. The activity provided opportunities for participants to practice implementation of new concepts and procedures.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
25. Results of the activity were reported at a regional meeting of scholars.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
26. As a result of this activity, the faculty member received special recognition from a regional association of practitioners.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
27. Specialized materials originally produced for the activity have been adopted by several faculty members for use in on-campus instruction.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
28. The participants were helped to engage in their own independent inquiry during the activity.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____
29. The activity met a clearly identified educational need.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	X	X	X	X _____

How important do you think each of the following items should be in influencing a decision to award promotions and tenure on the UIUC campus? (Circle one answer code for each item.)

Which one of the following groups do you feel should be used as the most appropriate single source of evaluation for each type of evidence? (Circle one answer code for each item.)

	Importance Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 High	Peers at UIUC	Peers at comparable universities	Participants in the activities	Other (Specify)
30. As a result of this activity, the faculty member received special recognition from a state association of practitioners.		X	X	X	X _____
31. The faculty member's work on this activity was cited frequently in scholarly journals.		X	X	X	X _____
32. Participants improved the quality of their professional practice as a result of this activity.		X	X	X	X _____
33. As a result of this activity, the faculty member received special recognition from a national association of practitioners.		X	X	X	X _____
34. Materials developed for the activity reflect recent research in the field.		X	X	X	X _____
35. Faculty at comparable universities have requested materials related to the activity from the faculty member.		X	X	X	X _____
36. Results of the activity were reported at a national meeting of scholars.		X	X	X	X _____

How important do you think each of the following items should be in influencing a decision to award promotions and tenure on the UIUC campus? (Circle one answer code for each item.)		Which one of the following groups do you feel should be used as the most appropriate single source of evaluation for each type of evidence? (Circle one answer code for each item.)			
37. As a result of their satisfaction with this activity, program sponsors plan to support similar efforts in the future.	Importance Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 High	Peers at UIUC: X	Peers at comparable universities: X	Participants in the activities: X	Other (Specify): X _____
38. The instructional approach used in this activity reflects both concern for the subject matter and responsiveness to the participants.	Importance Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 High	Peers at UIUC: X	Peers at comparable universities: X	Participants in the activities: X	Other (Specify): X _____
39. As a result of this activity, the faculty member received special recognition from a state association of scholars.	Importance Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 High	Peers at UIUC: X	Peers at comparable universities: X	Participants in the activities: X	Other (Specify): X _____
40. The results of the activity were published in a noted journal for practitioners.	Importance Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 High	Peers at UIUC: X	Peers at comparable universities: X	Participants in the activities: X	Other (Specify): X _____

41a. If you had been asked to judge the activities of a faculty member whose contribution to continuing education and public service activities constituted 50% of their time to continuing education and public service instead of 20%, do you think you would have answered any of the above questions differently?

Yes. 1

No (Skip to question 42). 2

b. How would your answers have differed?

_____

_____

_____

42. Fow how many years (in total) have you served UIUC in a tenure-track position?

_____ years

43a. Have you been awarded tenure at UIUC?

Yes. 1

No (Skip to question 44). 2

b. In what year were you awarded tenure?

19____

44. About what percentage of your commitment to the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign has been spent in continuing education and public service activities during each of the academic years listed below?

1979-80 _____%
1978-79 _____%
1977-78 _____%

45. During the past three academic years, have you served on a. . . .(Circle one answer code for each item.)

	Yes	No
a. Departmental promotion and tenure committee	1	2
b. College promotion and tenure committee	1	2
c. Campus promotion and tenure committee	1	2

Thank you for your cooperation.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

September 17, 1981

Deans, Directors, and Department Heads
Academic and Administrative Units
Urbana-Champaign Campus

Dear Colleagues:

For the past two years, the Office of Continuing Education and Public Service has been working with senior faculty members and academic administrators involved in the promotion and tenure review process to establish a faculty guide for planning and evaluating continuing education and public service activities. The faculty guide is intended to assist faculty members to evaluate the excellence, creativity, and scholarship of their continuing education and public service efforts and to relate these efforts to the promotion and tenure review process.

An abstract of the recently completed guide is enclosed for your review. A copy of the complete guide is available through the Office of Continuing Education and Public Service, 103 Illini Hall.

Cordially,

Edwin L. Goldwasser
Vice-chancellor for
Academic Affairs

ELG/rr

A Faculty Guide for Relating Continuing Education and Public Service to the Promotion and Tenure Review Process

ABSTRACT

This guide was prepared by the Office of Continuing Education and Public Service and is intended to assist UIUC faculty members to plan and evaluate their continuing education and public service activities and to better relate these activities to the promotion and tenure review process. The information and suggestions presented in the guide are based upon two years of extensive data collection, analysis, and collaboration with campus faculty members and academic administrators.

The campus guidelines for promotion and tenure make it clear that:

> Outstanding teaching and research by faculty members in continuing education and public service activities should be considered as equivalent to comparable performance in resident instruction and other research activities for purposes of promotion and tenure decisions. (1981-82 Academic Affairs Communication No. 11)

Discussions with promotion and tenure committee members at the departmental, college, and campus level suggest that this comparability is most firmly established when the evidence used to demonstrate outstanding continuing education and public service efforts is understood and accepted by those involved in the promotion and tenure review process.

The guide suggests a process for planning and evaluating continuing education and public service activities with the promotion and tenure review process in mind. These suggestions grew out of discussions with faculty members involved in the promotion and tenure process, a survey of promotion and tenure committee members, and an extensive review of faculty promotion and tenure papers.

Four points emerged from this work and are examined in the guide.

1. Faculty outreach efforts are most highly valued when they help demonstrate that the faculty member is "at the leading edge" and making significant contributions to new knowledge in his or her discipline or profession. Promotion and tenure committee members suggest that continuing education and public service efforts contribute most to scholarly stature when they are: reported or cited in scholarly publications, shown to have impact upon public policy, or demonstrate innovative breakthroughs in linking theory with practice.

2. Senior faculty members from other comparable institutions represent a valuable source of evidence regarding the excellence of a faculty member's continuing education and public service efforts. In particular, they can comment on the extent to which these activities have made a substantial contribution to the discipline or profession and the extent to which they have been recognized by other scholars, public policy makers, or practitioners.

3. If faculty continuing education and public service activities are to be used to help justify a favorable promotion or tenure decision, they should be planned with that use in mind. Faculty members should plan their efforts far in advance and design them for qualitative evaluation. Department chairs or heads should be involved in the planning process in order to insure that the faculty member's proposed continuing education and public service activities are consistent with departmental expectations. Departmental executive committee members, senior faculty members, and promotion and tenure committee members should also be asked to share their insights regarding the campus promotion and tenure process.

4. When preparing promotion and tenure papers, it is important to emphasize those continuing education and public service efforts which are truly innovative, creative, and supportive of the faculty member's scholarly stature. These efforts should be carefully and completely described with particular attention to the evaluation criteria and results. Where the normal criteria for judging scholarly excellence are not appropriate for judging a particular outreach activity, alternative criteria should be clearly described and justified.

This guide emphasizes the importance of planning early, understanding departmental expectations, designing activities with evaluation in mind, and being sure that any evaluation is consistent with the demands of the promotion and tenure review process. Far too often, innovative and scholarly faculty continuing education and public service activities fail to receive appropriate recognition because the faculty member did not pay proper attention to one or more of these considerations.

September 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Continuing Education and Public Service: What Are They?	2
General Criteria for Promotion and Tenure	4
Planning and Evaluating Continuing Education and Public Service Activities	5
Summary	12
Sources of Assistance	15

CONTINUING EDUCATION AND PUBLIC SERVICE:

WHAT ARE THEY?

At UIUC, the terms "continuing education" and "public service" represent the entire range of outreach and extension activities which go beyond resident instruction and discipline-oriented research. "Outreach" is often used as a synonym. The distinguishing characteristic of these activities is the projection of campus-based resources into locations, forms, and orientations appropriate to knowledge-users, wherever they may be.

Continuing education involves teaching individuals who attend credit and non-credit courses, workshops, or seminars, generally on a part-time or short-term basis. On-campus teaching prepares students who will utilize acquired knowledge in their professions after leaving campus. Continuing education generally involves taking the resources of the campus to active professionals who are interested in improving their current practice.

Public service typically entails application of scholarship to the needs of individual and organizational clients in specific settings. Public service activities include decision-oriented applied research and consultation efforts conducted either full-time or as a part of University responsibility. In addition, services to the public are sometimes by-products of research projects in fields such as agriculture, engineering, and speech therapy. Public service is not the same as service to the campus through committee involvement or service to a particular discipline through professional association membership or journal editorship. Discipline-oriented research focuses primarily upon increasing knowledge in specific fields. Off-campus public service usually involves the application of current knowledge to the

resolution of current practical problems.[1]

Continuing education and public service - or university outreach- are integral and important aspects of the teaching and research mission of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

A 1981-82 memorandum on promotion and tenure of faculty states:

> "Outstanding teaching and research by faculty members in continuing education and public service activities should be considered as equivalent to comparable performance in resident instruction and other research activities for purposes of promotion and tenure decisions. In all instances, criteria of excellence, innovation, creativity, and scholarship should be applied. However, the appropriate evidence of excellence and procedures for making judgments will vary among fields of study and with the mix of research, resident instruction and continuing education. Some flexibility will have to be maintained in applying the normal standards."[2]

The quality of scholarly effort is currently the major criterion for promotion or tenure on this campus. Outstanding outreach efforts of UIUC faculty, however, are often and should be recognized within the promotion and tenure process. Although it is much easier to measure and report the quantity of one's outreach involvement (the number of continuing education courses taught or number of public service activities conducted), indications of quality are absolutely necessary to assist promotion and tenure committees in their decisions.

The remainder of this guide is intended to provide assistance in relating faculty continuing education and public service activities to the UIUC promotion and tenure process.

---

[1]These definitions are based upon the following documents:

"Policy Issues and Planning Targets for Educational Services to the Off-Campus Public: Statement of the University Council on Public Service," Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Illinois, September, 1976, and, "A Statement on the Evaluation of Outreach Teaching and Scholarship," Campus Committee on Teaching and Service, UIUC, March 31, 1978.

[2]1981-82 Academic Affairs Communication No. 11, p. 3.

GENERAL CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Early in the fall semester of each year, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs distributes a memorandum which specifies the schedule for submission and review of recommendations for faculty promotions. In addition to the schedule, the memorandum identifies the general criteria for faculty promotion on the UIUC campus. The general criteria are:

- "Promotion to associate professor should be requested only if an individual shows real promise that he/she will become a leading researcher/teacher/scholar or a creative artist. Promise should, in fact, be fortified by tangible, developing evidence."

- "Promotion from associate professor to professor should... normally be based upon promise fulfilled. A move to the rank of professor should be accompanied by evidence of the attainment of national or international stature in a field."[3]

Individual academic units may have additional or different criteria for their faculty, but the general criteria apply to all campus faculty members.

It is important to keep in mind that continuing education and public service activities become significant considerations in the promotion and tenure review process to the extent that they contribute to a faculty member's stature as a researcher/teacher/scholar or creative artist in his/her field. Accordingly, faculty members who include outreach activities in their promotion and tenure papers should make a special effort to link these activities with the promotion and tenure criteria utilized at the departmental, college, and campus levels.

---

[3] 1981-82 Academic Affairs Communication No. 11, p. 2

PLANNING AND EVALUATING CONTINUING EDUCATION AND PUBLIC SERVICE ACTIVITIES

Planning

As you plan your involvement in continuing education and public service, begin by developing a clear understanding of your academic department's interpretation of the campus reward structure. It is within the department that you must establish what is actually expected of you and what is not. If the continuing education or public service requirements of your appointment preclude opportunities to do research in the usual sense, it is especially important that your department's expectations and criteria be developed and explained clearly to college and campus committees on promotions and tenure.

For cases in which a criterion of national stature may not apply, campus policy states that, "explicit criteria for judging the quality of performance must be developed, and there should be ample evidence that these criteria are being met in an exemplary fashion."[4]

Optimally, you will be able to plan and conduct activities which address the needs and interests of your department, yourself, and your field to maximize potential mutual benefit. Informal discussions with senior members of your department's faculty, members of the department promotion and tenure review committee, and the department head or chair can help to establish a clear sense of those outreach activities which would be valued:

---

[4] 1981-82 Academic Affairs Communication No. 11, p. 4.

- Has the department established a history of quality in outreach - or will you be breaking new ground?

- Are off-campus forms of applied research (public service) or off-campus instruction (continuing education) encouraged?

- Does your department expect you to be involved in outreach or would they prefer that you attend to traditional research and scholarship until after you have attained indefinite tenure?

As you plan your initial involvement in outreach activities, consider the following questions as a way of relating those activities to the promotion and tenure process:

- To what extent do the activities represent potential for significant contributions to the generation or application of knowledge?

- Is there continuity among program ideas - or do they present a "shotgun" array of activities?

- Can the proposed activities be evaluated in ways meaningful to promotion and tenure committee members at the department, college, and campus levels?

It is important that you establish a dialogue with your department regarding expectations related to your professional development and productivity. A dialogue of this type should continue throughout your career in the department and will allow you to benefit from the experience and expertise of the department's senior faculty members.

Once specific outreach activities are identified, discussion should become more focused on the form and substance of evaluation:

- What would constitute excellence in your proposed outreach activities?

- What sorts of evidence would indicate excellent faculty effort in these activities?

- Who should be involved in the evaluation of your outreach activities?

- What should be the form of that evaluation?

Many activities in continuing education and public service are the products of collaborative or cooperative effort. Tenure and promotions, however, are awarded to individuals for individual performance and not to teams, task forces, or committees. Consider the unique contributions you are likely to make through your planned outreach activities and develop evaluative structures which will keep track of those contributions.

By the time you are ready to begin your continuing education and public service activities, you should have the benefit of sharpened insight into the campus reward system, your department's expectations regarding your professional activity and professional development, your unique role in proposed outreach activities, and how you are going to keep track of the quality of your efforts.

Evaluating

Most discussions of educational programming place evaluation at the end of a seemingly linear sequence of steps. An undesirable effect of this kind of thinking is that evaluation of educational programs - and particularly of outreach activities - seems to take place as an afterthought. Too often, the challenge is past, the excitement is done, and evaluation is the last remaining chore. This need not and should not be the case.

Evaluation serves two main purposes: assessment of processes and content as the activity progresses so that improvements can be made while underway (formative evaluation), and assessment of outcomes of activities so that the worth of the total effort may be judged (summative evaluation). As a faculty member, you are likely to be concerned about both types of evaluation. Members of promotion and tenure committees will be concerned primarily with results of summative evaluations - assessments of the quality and impact of your efforts.

Keep in mind that, as promotion and tenure papers move up through the college and campus review process, they are likely to be assessed by faculty members who have little familiarity with you or your scholarly activities. Accordingly, the evaluation of your outreach efforts should be described in a thorough, precise, and jargon-free manner, and with an emphasis on specific and demonstrable measures (both qualitative and quantitative) of excellence. Each continuing education and public service activity included in your promotion and tenure papers should be accompanied by evaluative information that demonstrates the activity's scholarly significance.

Types of Evidence

Given the diversity of activities which occur under the rubrics of continuing education and public service, evaluation might focus upon any of several aspects of faculty performance.

In the Spring of 1980, a survey was conducted on the UIUC campus. A sample of 255 faculty members was asked to rate several types of evidence regarding continuing education and public service which might be considered in support of applications for tenure or promotion. Types of evidence were rated in terms of their importance and the most appropriate source of evaluative information was identified for each type of evidence. Fifty-six percent of those surveyed responded. Of the respondents, fifty-two percent had served on a departmental promotion and tenure review committee during the prior three years.

The types of evidence which were rated as most important were concerned primarily with the faculty member's standing as a scholar in his/her field.

Generation of new theory in one's field, demonstration that one is "... at the leading edge" of a discipline or specialization, and recognition from national associations of scholars are all considered of great importance in determining who should receive tenure.

Public service activities which include original research and which truly extend the knowledge base of a discipline or profession would seem to be the most likely to merit attention in the review process. Publication of project results is valued highly, but the importance of publication in research journals is rated much more highly than publication in journals for practitioners. Citation of the candidate's work in scholarly journals is also valued highly as is evidence of a direct connection between continuing education or public service activities and the current direction of research in the candidate's field.

Impact upon public policy and requests for the faculty member's assistance in the public policy arena may occur as a result of outreach work and both are viewed as important outcomes which would weigh quite heavily in promotion and tenure review.

Faculty members who take truly innovative, creative, and scholarly approaches to public service resulting in impact upon local or state public policy would do well to present evaluative evidence which focuses upon the nature and quality of the approaches they used rather than simply upon the outcomes of their work. Innovations in approach may well hold promise to extend the methods, knowledge, or scope of impact of a field or discipline. Such innovations in process are often difficult to document, but may be impossible to document effectively if considered only as an afterthought.

Improved professional practice is a major objective of many programs in continuing education and public service. Indeed, survey respondents rated improvement of professional practice as a very important outcome in the assessment of outreach effort in promotion and tenure decisions. Outcomes which reflect the research orientation of the UIUC faculty were rated highest among practice-related criteria. For example, the creative application of research to practical problems and increased practitioner awareness of the practical implications of theory are very highly valued. Again, these aspects of continuing education and public service are difficult, though not impossible, to evaluate. More tangible, and similarly highly valued practice-related outcomes are publication in noted practitioner journals and special recognition from national practitioner associations.

Other types of outcomes might be highly desirable from the perspective of many members of the UIUC faculty at a given point in time, for example; identification of educational needs, development of curricular materials, and development of materials or techniques which result in changes in on-campus instruction. Overall, however, it appears that those who review promotion and tenure materials at UIUC rate all of these types of potential outcomes considerably below research, public policy impact, and integration of research and practice.

Sources of Evaluative Information

Given these various potential areas of impact for continuing education and public service activities, who should be the sources of evaluative information for each? Information must be gathered from faculty members or professional

specialists at other institutions regarding the work of candidates for promotion and tenure. Student and peer evaluations of teaching are also required.

Faculty peers at comparable institutions are viewed as the most important source of evaluative information regarding significance and quality of scholarly activity. Peers at other institutions may also be utilized as references regarding the public policy impact of your work and the extent to which your efforts have been recognized by national associations of practitioners or have been published in noted journals for practitioners. It is important to bear in mind that "peers" in this sense are peers of those who are charged with making promotion and tenure decisions and not the peers of the candidate. Assistant professors at other institutions should not be used as references for those who hope to advance from assistant to associate professor rank.

There is not only an opportunity, but a requirement that the qualifications of references be made explicit in promotion papers. If a faculty member from a comparable institution is to comment upon your leadership in your field or your contributions to theory through outreach efforts, it is imperative that review committee members be able to identify why this particular person is to be viewed by them as highly qualified to assess your standing.

Comments by faculty peers from other comparable institutions should be specific and concise. The context in which you are being judged and the qualifications and background of the evaluator are all critical to the ultimate impact of the reference. The more familiar your references are with your outreach efforts. other similar efforts, and your field in general, and the more focused their evaluative comments, the more helpful will be their evaluations of your work.

Faculty peers at UIUC are viewed as the most credible source of information regarding the impact of your outreach work upon your on-campus teaching and that of others at UIUC. They are also among the most credible sources of information regarding the impact of your outreach activities upon public policy and the contribution of your activity to the enhancement of working relationships between scholars and practitioners. They can also aid interpretation of standardized evaluations of your teaching or service.

Participants in outreach activities conducted by UIUC faculty are usually active professionals in various fields. As such, their primary professional focus is usually the application of current knowledge to practical problems. As a result, their evaluations of your research capabilities, the extent to which you have been recognized by the scholarly community, or your leadership in your academic discipline will not weigh heavily. Participants are, however, in an appropriate position to assess the contribution of your work to any increase of their awareness of the practical implications of theory or to any improvement of their professional practice. Indeed, documentation of your contribution to their professional improvement seems to be the most potent single manner in which their comments can support your case in the review process.

SUMMARY

This guide has discussed several aspects of planning and evaluating faculty contributions to continuing education and public service activities. The focus has been upon relating outreach activities to the promotion and tenure process at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Throughout the guide, it has been emphasized that continuing education and public service activities

must be planned, evaluated, and reported if outstanding efforts are to be rewarded. It seems appropriate to conclude this presentation by summarizing the major suggestions from the text:

First, understand the institution. The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign is a major research-oriented instituion. The general criteria applied to the judgment of merit reflect this orientation. The promotion and tenure process, however, begins in the individual academic departments or units, so ...

Understand departmental expectations. Departments vary in the emphasis they give to continuing education and public service activities. Department heads or chairpersons and other senior faculty members in the department can help to clarify your department's expectations concerning the kinds of activities you should be engaged in, and the criteria to be used in judging your performance at the departmental and college level.

Design activities with evaluation in mind. If you become involved in continuing education and public service, include evaluation as part of the planning of any outreach activity. The best way to assure that your outreach efforts will be assessed at the end of an activity is to develop evaluative mechanisms which will track those efforts from the beginning.

Design evaluation with the promotion and tenure process in mind. You may want to evaluate both to improve your work along the way and to assess its quality at the end of an activity. Your evaluation should consider the kinds of evidence and the outcomes which will be meaningful to promotion and tenure committee members at the department, college, and campus levels. Simple listing of activities, without attention to assessment of quality does little to enhance

a case for promotion or tenure. Identify relevant evaluative criteria and check your judgment against the judgment of colleagues.

Emphasize quality. Extensive lists of continuing education and public service activities do not necessarily indicate anything about the quality of any of those activities. Indeed, high-quality outreach activities may be obscured or invisible when buried in a lengthy list of unevaluated activities. Focus upon those few instances in which your best efforts have been evaluated systematically. Describe briefly the activity, its outcomes, the evaluation procedures used, the context in which comparisons were made, and the qualifications of evaluators.

Start early. Preparation for evaluation of your work by promotion and tenure committees should begin early in your appointment at UIUC. As outreach activities are planned, conducted, and evaluated, consider how those activities might best be interpreted to committees considering you for promotion or tenure. Development of high-quality continuing education and public service activities takes time and effort. Thoughtful evaluation and reporting of evaluation results also require time and effort. Beginning early will help to avoid a last-minute rush to document your work and should result in clearer and more complete interpretation of your continuing education and public service activities.

Seek help. There are many sources of assistance available to UIUC faculty members as they plan, conduct, evaluate, and report their continuing education and public service work. Beginning in your department, utilize the experience and insight of others to help maximize the impact of your outreach activities for continuing education students, public service clients, your department's progress toward its programmatic objectives, and for your own professional growth and career development.

SOURCES OF ASSISTANCE

Listed below are some of the UIUC campus units which can provide assistance in planning, conducting, evaluating, and reporting your continuing education and public service activities.

	TYPE OF ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE			
	Needs Assessment	Program Planning	Adult Teaching Methods	Evaluation
CIRCE (Center for Instructional Reasearch and Curriculum Evaluation, 270 Education, 333-3771	X			X
OCEPS (Office of Continuing Education and Public Service, 103 Illini Hall, 333-7368	X	X	X	X
OIR/MARD (Office of Instructional Resources, Measurement and Research Division, 307 Engineering, 333-3490			X	X

IGPA (Institute of Government and Public Affairs), 1201 West Nevada, Urbana, 333-3340, and the University Office of Legislative Programs, 359 Administration, 333-1086, can provide assistance and information regarding consultation to state agencies and other public service clients.

Finally, information and assistance regarding the UIUC promotion and tenure review process are available from the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, 107 Coble Hall, 333-2759.